

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

TIMOTHY J. LAURICELLA, on behalf)
of himself and all others similarly)
situated in Arizona,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, AU)
OPTRONICS CORPORATION AMERICA, CHI)
MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CO., LTD., CHI)
MEI OPTOELECTRONICS USA, INC.,)
CHUNGHWA PICTURE TUBES, LTD.,)
FUJITSU LIMITED, INC., FUJITSU)
AMERICA, INC., HANNSTAR DISPLAY)
CORPORATION, HITACHI, LTD.,)
HITACHI DISPLAYS, LTD., HITACHI)
AMERICA, LTD., INTERNATIONAL)
DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,)
INTERNATIONAL DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY)
USA, INC., IPS ALPHA TECHNOLOGY,)
LTD., LG PHILIPS LCD CO., LTD,)
LG PHILIPS LCD AMERICA, INC.,)
MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO.,)
LTD., PANASONIC CORPORATION OF)
NORTH AMERICA, MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC)
CORPORATION, MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC &)
ELECTRONICS USA, INC., NEC)
ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, NEC)
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., NEC LCD)
TECHNOLOGIES, LTD., SAMSUNG)
ELECTRONICS COMPANY, LTD., SAMSUNG)
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., SANYO)
ELECTRIC CO., LTD., SANYO NORTH)
AMERICA CORP., EPSON IMAGING)
DEVICES CORPORATION, SEIKO EPSON)
CORPORATION, EPSON AMERICA, INC.,)
EPSON ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,)
SHARP CORPORATION, SHARP)
ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, S-LCD)
CORPORATION, SYNTAX-BRILLIAN CORP.,)
TOSHIBA CORPORATION, TOSHIBA)
AMERICA, INC., TOSHIBA MATSUSHITA)
DISPLAY TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., and)
JOHN DOES 1-100,)

Defendants.)

No. 2:07-cv-0549-HRH

O R D E R

Stipulation for
Extension of Time

Pursuant to the joint stipulation of counsel for Plaintiff Timothy J. Lauricella and Defendant SANYO North America Corp. ("SANYO"), filed on April 11, 2007,¹

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The deadline for SANYO to respond to the Complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; (2) forty-five days after Plaintiff provides a written notice to SANYO that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case; or (3) as ordered by the MDL transferee court.

2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for Plaintiff or further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify Plaintiff in writing of their intention to join this extension.

3. Plaintiff, SANYO, and any other named defendants that provide notice of their intention to join this extension pursuant to the preceding paragraph agree that such defendant shall not contest the sufficiency of process or service of process. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver of any other defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or improper venue.

¹ Docket No. 24.

4. Plaintiff, SANYO, and any defendant joining this extension pursuant to paragraph 2 agree that, notwithstanding the above paragraphs, should any defendant to whom this extension applies respond to any complaint in another LCD Case prior to the date contemplated by this Stipulation, then such defendant shall make a simultaneous response to the Complaint in the above-captioned matter.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 12th day of April, 2007.

/s/ H. Russel Holland
United States District Judge